

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated March 17, 2003, Applicant has amended claims 28, 44 and 146, cancelled claims 9 and 133, and added new claims 147-151 together with filing a Request for Continued Examination. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the Examiner's allowance of claims 5-8, 11-12, 26, 53, 125, 128-132 and 134-135. Applicant also acknowledges, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 32-35 and 38-39 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Amended Claims 28 and 146.

Applicant has amended claims 28 and 146 to include the limitation "at least two visually perceptible target elements disposed on the target body in a two dimensional array configuration" and "a handle extending from the target body, positioned and configured to prevent the target elements from being visually obscured when held by a user." Adequate descriptive support for the amendment can be found in, for example, Fig. 2 and the first full paragraph at page 13 of the specification. Applicant has also replaced the term "vehicle" with "object" in the claims to make it clear that the claims are not limited to the measurement of a location on a vehicle. The specification simply discloses one of the examples of the invention.

Applicant submits that prior art references of record, i.e., Hendrix and Jackson, do not disclose the above limitations. If the two dimensional array configuration of target

body elements were applied to a Hendrix's probe 18A (see Fig. 6), a user's hand is likely to obscure the target elements from a vision imaging system. The reason is that the probe 18A is small enough to have such target elements disposed in the two dimensional configuration. On the other hand, the claimed invention further includes the handle extending from the target body, configured to prevent the target elements from being obscured when held by a user. Because of the handle, a user can hold the target body to be viewed by a vision imagery system, without hiding any target elements. Therefore, the vision imaging system can acquire the image of all the target elements on the target body, resulting in achievement of accurate determination of a location of the target body.

Applicant solicits favorable consideration of claims 28 and 146 as well as depending claims 29-31, 36-37, 44-49, 51-52 and 127.

Claims 17 and 136.

Although the Examiner asserted that Hendrix discloses all the limitations recited in claims 17 and 136, Applicant submits that Hendrix does not disclose the limitation "an attachment device to stabilize... the point on the point definer relative to the position of the vehicle to be located." This is so because it is apparent, as shown in Figs. 11, 12 and 13 of Hendrix, that the position of a conical member 86 which, according to the Examiner, corresponds to a point definer of the claimed invention, is not stabilized relative to the position of the vehicle to be located. The Examiner did not point out that where Hendrix shows how to stabilize by the connector 41 the point of the conical member 86 relative to the position of the vehicle to be located.

Applicant solicits favorable consideration of claims 17 and 136 as well as depending claims 18-25, 126 and 137-145.

New Claims 147-151.

Applicant has added claims 148 and 149. Adequate descriptive support for the new claims can be found in, for example, Fig. 2 and the first full paragraph at page 13 of the specification. Applicant submits that claims 148 and 149 should be patentable over the cited references of record based on the same reason discussed with respect to claims 28 and 146.

As to new claims 147 and 150, adequate descriptive support for the new claims can be found in, for example, the first full paragraph at page 11 of the specification. Applicant submits that claims 147 and 150 should be patentable because of their dependency from claims 28 and 149. It is noted that dependency of claim 44 has been changed in response to amendment to claim 28 and addition of claim 147.

Applicant has also added claim 151. Adequate descriptive support for this claim can be found in, for example, the last paragraph bridging pages 1 and 2, and the first full paragraph at page 22. Applicant believes that Hendrix does not disclose all the limitations recited in claim 151.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SAB:TT:khh
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: June 17, 2003